Motion to pass.

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—Sir, I beg to move :

"That the Mysore Housing Board Bill, 1954, as reported by the Joint Select Committee, be passed."

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is:

"That the Mysore Housing Board Bill, 1954, as reported by the Joint Select Committee, be passed."

The motion was adopted.

CATTLE TRESPASS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1954.

Motion to consider.

Dr. R. NAGAN GOWDA (Minister for Agriculture).—Sir, I beg to move :

"That the Mysore Cattle Trespass (Amendment) Bill, 1954, as passed by the Legislative Council, be taken into consideration."

In doing so I wish to say just a few words. The original Bill . . .

Sri K. PATTABHIRAMAN (Kolar).—On a point of clarification, Sir. In the Statement of Objects and Reasons which you have appended to this Bill and circulated to us, it is said at the top that it refers to the Bill as introduced in the Legislative Council. But the Bill itself is as passed by the Legislative Council. So the Bill does not conform itself to what the Statement of Objects and Reasons refers to. It requires to be recast.

Sri T. MARIAPPA (Mysore City—North).—But there is a note at the end of the Statement that Clauses 5, 6, 7, 8 and 10 and part of Clause 12 have been deleted and the clauses renumbered.

Dr. R. NAGAN GOWDA.—I was going to make a reference to the original Bill as was introduced in the Legislative Council. There were two objects in view as stated . . .

Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY (Chitaldrug).—Please recast it and then place it before the House.

*Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK (Molakalmuru).—Whatever explanation he may give, he may give it later. According to the Bill, the Statement of Objects and Reasons cannot remain as is envisaged here. So this Bill is neither helpful nor is it of any use at all. The Cattle Trespass Act, as it stood originally, is standing so today. Therefore let him not take the trouble of moving this Bill. Let him drop it and then along with other Bills relating to Extension of Laws to Bellary, let him bring. There is no purpose to be served now, though the Statement of Objects and Reasons says that this Bill is to save agricultural crops from being damaged by cattle.

Mr. SPEAKER.—May I bring to the notice of the Hon'ble Member that he can speak on the Bill after the motion is moved ?

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—But it is fundamentally wrong to take this Bill into consideration.

Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY.—Sri K. Pattabhiraman took objection to the way in which the Bill is drafted. What is the opinion of the Chair regarding that ?

1-30 P.M.

*Sri T. MARIAPPA.—May I add a few words ? Sir, in the original Statement of Objects and Reasons the main idea of the Government in introducing this Bill—not the Bill which is introduced in this House, but the Bill which was introduced in the Legislative Council,—was to make the law more stringent and to prevent cattle trespass. Under the Cattle Trespass Act, 1871 the cultivator or occupier of any land may seize cattle trespassing on his land and causing damage to any crop or produce and send them to a cattle pound. The cattle so impounded will be delivered to the owner only if he pays the fine prescribed under the Act and the question of deposit is made a condition precedent. That was the idea. The Bill as it is sought to be introduced now as it finally emerged from the other House merely has the effect of leaving original Act as it is except for extending the period for claiming the surplus sale proceeds mentioned in clause 9, to six months, and extending the operation of the Act to Bellary under clause 2. There is

(SRI T. MARIAPPA.)

already an Act in force in Bellary. Repealing that and extending this Act is the main object. Unfortunately what has happened is, clauses 5,6,7,8, 10 and part of 12 have all been deleted by the Upper House. Sir, after the House of elders has gone through the provisions very carefully and all the material provisions have been deleted, I very earnestly request the Hon'ble Minister for Agriculture to consider what is the earthly use of this Bill. Is it merely to have the satisfaction of having added a new Act while the present Act will serve the purpose? It is much safer and much better that it is not taken up at all. After all, let it not be said that legislation was brought without substance.

MR. SPEAKER.—I was able to understand the point of the Hon'ble Member. If the Hon ble Minister does not want to move, it is a different thing. Otherwise, he is at liberty.

SRI K. PATTABHIRAMAN.—Sir, we are making definite suggestions with regard to two aspects of the matter. Here is a Bill which is introduced before us with a certain Statement of Objects and Reasons which deals with certain provisions which have no relation to the Bill placed before us. What were the considerations that prevailed in the other House to make these changes and how this child which was there and which has been sent down to this House maimed, are not strictly before us. The fact remains that the Statement of Objects and Reasons relates to a number of provisions which do not find a place in the body of the Bill as presented to us.

Secondly, as my Hon'ble Friend Sri T. Mariappa suggested, the Bill placed before us, except in making a small change from three to six months in clause 9 and extending the provisions to Bellary, does not contain any worthwhile provisions. Sir, I am not attempting to say anything derogatory to any Hon'ble Member in this House, least of all to the Hon'ble Minister in charge of the Bill, when I say that the time of this House is going to be spent on a certain piece of legislation which will not add anything to the Statute Book nor take away anything except making a small change *viz.*, three months to six months in a particular clause. Therefore, the main question that you will have to consider is whether the time of this House should be spent upon this legislation and whether the Hon'ble Agriculture Minister in charge of this particular Bill is serious in his suggestion that we should spend fifteen minutes or half-an-hour on this Bill which makes no substantial change whatever or, shall I say, no change whatever. These are the two aspects I want the Speaker as well as the Hon'ble Minister to consider and give us their valuable guidance.

SRI A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO (Minister for Law and Education).—I see the points of view expressed by the Hon'ble Members, Sir. I feel that on the whole they are making out a case for the Bill to be withdrawn. Let me have some time to consider. This Bill may be taken up later.

MR. SPEAKER.—The House will now take up the Mysore Transfer of Prisoners Bill, 1954.

MYSORE TRANSFER OF PRISONERS BILL, 1954.

SRI A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO (Minister for Law and Education).—Sir, I beg to move:

"That the Mysore Transfer of Prisoners Bill, 1954, as passed by the Legislative Council, be taken into consideration."

Sir, we have a Central Jail in Bangalore and a sub-jail in Mysore and a number of other lock-ups. In Bellary there is a central jail, there is a certified school for children and there is also a Borstal school for adolescents. In Bellary there is a provision for, accommodating 3,000 prisoners in the central jail and there is provision for giving training for a large number of youthful offenders. In Mysore the accommodation in the Central Jail is for about 1,400 and for about 450 in the sub-jail at Mysore. So far back as 1943 two Acts have been passed, the Borstal